Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 89, 113, 126, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135 and 137 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Of pending claims 89-126 and 128-137, claims 94-112 and 117-125 have been withdrawn.

Claim 89 has been amended to clarify that: 1) a bubble packet transmitter transmits the bubble packet to a destination bubble packet transmitting port of the second communication control unit, 2) a reply packet transmitter transmits a plurality of reply packets to the bubble packet transmitting port which is shown by the bubble packet transmitting port information via a plurality of reply packet transmitting ports of the second communication control unit and 3) the plurality of reply packet transmitting ports includes the destination bubble packet transmitting port. Claims 113 and 126 have been amended similarly to claim 89. No new matter is introduced herein. Support for the amendment includes, for example, page 34, line 17 - page 35, line 11; and Fig. 12 of the subject specification. Claims 129, 131, 132, 134, 135 and 137 have been amended to correspond with respective claims 89, 113 and 126.

On page 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the feature of "plural reply packets using multiple different ports of the transmitting NAT" is not recited in the claims. Applicants note that claims 89, 113 and 126, as amended, clarifies the location and relation of the multiple ports (to transmit the reply packets) and the destination bubble packet transmitting port.

Claims 113-116, 126, 128 and 132-137 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-7 of co-pending U.S. application 11/510,487 in view of Takeda et al. (US 2004/0139228, referred to herein as "Takeda"). It is submitted that, because this is a provisional rejection, Applicants are not required to substantively respond to this provisional rejection until the cited application issues and the rejection is thus, no longer provisional.

Claims 89-93, 113-116, 126 and 128-137 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeda. It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 89, as amended, includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

> ... a reply packet transmitter for transmitting a plurality of reply packets to the bubble packet transmitting port which is shown by the bubble packet transmitting port information via a plurality of reply packet transmitting ports of the second communication control unit, the plurality of reply packet transmitting ports including the destination bubble packet transmitting port ... (Emphasis added)

Claims 113 and 126 include similar recitations.

Takeda discloses, in Fig. 16A, a communication system including endpoint server 629 and browser 630 connected to IP network 1606 via respective NATs 1602, 1604. (Paragraphs [0190-0191].) Endpoint server 629 and browser 630 communicate with NAT-discovery server 622 to determine the respective address/port pair (for example, respective port IDs, 50012, 49152) via paths 1607A, 1607B. (Paragraph [0192].) As shown in Fig. 16B, endpoint server 629 can send prediction-based breakout packets (BOPs) from one of its ports to multiple ports of NAT 1604. (Paragraph [0194-0195].) As shown in Fig. 16C, browser 630 can then send a BOP from one of its ports to multiple ports of NAT 1602. (Paragraphs [0199-0200].) As shown in Figs. 19A-19C, Takeda teaches that browser 630 sends a single BOP to endpoint server 629, indicated by path 1918. (Paragraphs [0221-0225].)

Takeda, however, does not disclose or suggest a reply packet transmitter for transmitting a plurality of reply packets to the bubble packet transmitting port via a plurality of reply packet transmitting ports of the second communication control unit, where the plurality of reply packet transmitting ports includes the destination bubble packet transmitting port of the second communication control unit, as required by claim 89 (emphasis added). Takeda is silent regarding these features. In Fig. 16C of Takeda, one port is used to transmit a plurality of reply packets. In contrast, Applicants' claim uses multiple ports to transmit a plurality of reply packets.

Applicants claimed communication system also includes an advantage over Takeda. In Takeda, a single reply packet has a higher possibility of not being accepted

at the target terminal when the port status is changed. In contrast, according to Applicants' Invention, because plural reply packets are transmitted from plural ports, one of the reply packets may be accepted at the target terminal even when the port status has changed. Thus, Takeda does not include all of the features or the advantages of Applicants' claim 89. Accordingly, allowance of claim 89 is respectfully requested.

Although not identical to claim 89, claims 113 and 126 include features similar to claim 113 which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, allowance of claims 113 and 126 is respectfully requested for at least the same reasons as claim 89.

Claims 90-93, 114-116 and 128-137 include all of the features of respective claims 89, 113 and 126 from which they depend. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as respective claims 89, 113 and 126.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

DMG/nm/fp

Dated: March 17, 2011

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM1130137